

James A. Bruen (State Bar No. 43880)
 Charles M. Sink (State Bar No. 78168)
 Thomas B. Mayhew (State Bar No. 183539)
 Carl E. Switzer (State Bar No. 211858)
 Arjun Agarwal (State Bar No. 233576)
 Farella Braun + Martel LLP
 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 954-4400
 Facsimile: (415) 954-4480
 E-Mail: jbruen@fbm.com
 E-Mail: csink@fbm.com
 E-Mail: tmayhew@fbm.com
 E-Mail: cswitzer@fbm.com
 E-Mail: aagarwal@fbm.com

Ned N. Isokawa (State Bar No. 66287)
 Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP
 55 Second Street
 Twenty-Fourth Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Telephone: 415-856-7000
 Facsimile: 415-856-7100
 E-Mail: nedisokawa@paulhastings.com

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant
 GE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
 GLOBAL SIGNALING, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID
 TRANSIT DISTRICT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
 GLOBAL SIGNALING, LLC,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C 06-3749 JSW

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER
 TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS FOR REPLY
 BRIEFS IN SUPPORT OF MOTIONS FOR
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: May 14, 2010
 Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Courtroom: 11, 19th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White

Complaint Filed: June 13, 2006
 Trial Date: August 30, 2010

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM.

1 WHEREAS, the parties' reply briefs in support of their motions for summary judgment
2 are due to be filed by April 16, 2010;

3 WHEREAS defendant GE Transportation Systems Global Signaling, LLC ("GETS")
4 submits that good cause exists to allow the reply briefs to exceed the otherwise applicable limit of
5 15 pages for such reply briefs by up to 10 pages because (1) arguments raised in the opposition
6 briefs were not addressed in the opening briefs, (2) BART filed eight declarations in support of its
7 opposition brief, (3) 15 pages is otherwise insufficient because of the complexity of the case and
8 the importance of the issues within the case; and (4) plaintiff San Francisco Bay Area Rapid
9 Transit District has agreed to stipulate to an increase in the number of pages permitted as an
10 accommodation to GETS, and for the sake of reciprocity asks that any increase in the number of
11 pages permitted apply to both parties;

12 NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate, and respectfully request that the Court
13 so order, that the parties may file reply briefs in support of their motions for summary judgment
14 of up to 25 pages in length.

15 DATED: April 14, 2010

FARELLA, BRAUN & MARTEL, LLP

16
17
18 _____
THOMAS B. MAYHEW

19 Attorneys for Defendant
20 GE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS GLOBAL
SIGNALING, LLC

21 DATED: April 14, 2010

CROWLEY, STRINGER & FENSKE LLP


22
23
24 _____
ROBERT B. STRINGER

25 Attorneys for Plaintiff
26 SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT
27 DISTRICT
28

ORDER

Based on the parties' foregoing stipulation, and for good cause showing, the Court hereby orders that the parties may file reply briefs in support of their motions for summary judgment of up to 25 pages in length.

Dated: April 15, 2010



Jeffrey S. White
United States District Judge